

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/802,911

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

Marjorie A. Moran

Art Unit

1631

**All Participants:**

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(2) David Milligan.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 24 February 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 102

Claims discussed:

1-13

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**


**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that the after-final amendment and arguments file s2/17/04 had been fully considered, but that the amendment would not be entered. The combination of limitations recited in the amended claims had not been previously recited and was therefore a new issue requiring further search and consideration. The examiner noted that each of claims 3-11 had depended separately from claim 2, therefore the combination of limitations from several separate claims into claim 1 introduces a new issue. The examiner stated that the proposed amendment would overcome rejections under 35 USC 102, but that rejections under 35 USC 103 may be made over the amended claims, wherein such a new rejection would be necessitated by the amendment. .